

hundred years, because of the expense and length of the present one. Unless the interests of the people should suffer, the probability was that there would be no Convention speedily. But if they should withhold from the people this power, then they would see another state of things. His only object was to provide a mode—one that was truly republican—of letting the people express their opinions once in ten years. These reasons would control his vote.

The question was then taken on the amendment of Mr. BROWN to the substitute of Mr. FITZPATRICK,

And it was agreed to.

Mr. HICKS moved further to amend said substitute by striking out the word, "every," and inserting "the," and by striking out the word "hereafter," and after the word "taken," by inserting "in the year 1870 and in every twentieth year thereafter," which would give the people the power to call a Convention every twenty years

Mr. BOWIE said:

That he should vote against this amendment, for the very reason that he should vote against the original proposition of the gentleman from Allegany. He held that they had no right to put any shackles upon the right of the people to change the organic law.

He held that discontent would more speedily spring up under a system of shackles, for ten or twenty years, or for any length of time. He maintained the broad doctrine that whenever the people, through their representatives, thought proper to call a Convention, they should have the right to do so.

He had always maintained this doctrine. All who knew any thing of the course which he took in the legislature several years ago, and who would undertake to read his arguments, would see that he maintained this doctrine then. He was then in favor of repealing the 59th article of the Constitution. He was utterly opposed to all restrictions. He believed that if they would grant the people their rights, without limitation or restraint, they would feel happy, contented and satisfied.

It would not then be in the power of any agitator to raise exciting questions about their political rights. All the representatives of the counties in this Convention, should go against any limitation. Therefore, he should vote for the second section of the report, as reported by the gentleman from Calvert, (Mr. Sollers.) We should have more safety and more security against agitation, if the course should be adopted. This was his deliberate opinion, and he should adhere to it.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, desired to know if the gentleman regarded the legislature as synonymous with the people?

Mr. BOWIE replied, that no doubt, when public opinion required it, the legislature would call a Convention.

Mr. HICKS wished to know whether the very fact of being assembled here did not prove conclusively that the people were determined to

manage this matter in their own way? How had this Convention been kept here as long as it had? It had been by the different opinions existing among the people of the State in relation to its constitutionality. While some had believed that it was entirely within the meaning of the Constitution for the people to call a Convention whenever they were so disposed, others believed that it would be in conflict with that instrument. If they were disposed to submit this subject to the people, let them endeavor, by all possible means, to submit it to them in the most judicious way they could. All seemed to agree that it was important and desirable that they should do all in their power to allay this agitation. Could this be done, by leaving the subject to be agitated every year or every second year, and so on? If they should throw the door open for the holding of a Convention in so short a time as ten years, the agitation would commence forthwith. Had not this been foreshadowed in this Convention? The moment it was understood that a Convention could be called at a certain period, a portion of the people would raise a hue and cry that there were features in the Constitution injurious to some particular section, or to some particular class of people. They would clamor for a Convention, and if they should fix a period when a Convention should be held, reasonably remote, but certain, and arrange for its temporary operations in this Constitution, why the people would very likely submit to it, especially when they adverted to the fact that in 1850 a Convention assembled at the seat of government and that it took from the State treasury some one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. They would not be very apt to call a Convention again for trifling causes, certainly not in order merely to quiet this continual agitation gotten up by designing men and mere demagogues. He had been long enough engaged in public life, and as far as he had been able fighting against these agitations, to know that it was not profitable or pleasant to keep the public mind continually agitated. It seemed to him that the true course to be pursued here in offering every project, is to make it as acceptable to all as it could possibly be, and it appeared to him that twenty years was the proper time in which to call together a Convention, taking away the opportunity of creating frequent agitations, as this question always had created agitation, and always will. Let us substitute twenty for ten years, and give the people a little repose—yea, a little relief, in view of what the Convention is to cost them.

The question was then stated to be on agreeing to the amendment of Mr. HICKS.

Mr. ECCLESTON demanded the yeas and nays; Which were ordered;

And being taken, resulted as follows:

Affirmative.—Messrs. Blakistone, Ricaud, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Randall, Brent, of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, Dickinson, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Dahieli Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Thawley, Davis, Kilgour, Brewer and Waters—25.